

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 19, and 24-27 are pending in this application. Non-elected claims 25 and 26 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 19, 24, 25, and 27 are amended; and claims 2, 3, 5-11, 14-18, and 20-23 are canceled. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in the originally filed claims and in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0042]-[0046]. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 21-23, and 27 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 2, 5, and 21-23 are canceled, rendering their rejection moot. The remaining claims are variously amended to obviate the rejection in light of the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 14-18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,748,043 to Seaver et al. ("Seaver"). By this Amendment, claims 2, 5, 14-18, 21, and 22 are canceled, rendering their rejection moot. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the non-rejected subject matter of claim 10, thus obviating the rejection. Seaver does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and, thus, also is not anticipated by Seaver. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 13, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 27

Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 13, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 27 are rejected over Seaver as applied to claim 1, in view of various secondary references that are only relied upon by the Office Action for their asserted disclosure of the additional limitations respectively recited in dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 7-9, 13, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 27. By this Amendment, claims 3, 6-9, 20, and 23 are canceled, rendering their rejection moot. As to the remaining claims, none of the asserted teachings of the secondary references relied upon by the Office Action cures the deficiencies of the Seaver with respect to claim 1 discussed above.

Because claims 4, 13, 19, and 24 depend from claim 1, these deficiencies of Seaver with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 4, 13, 19, and 24. Independent claim 27 has similar features to claim 1 (the non-rejected subject matter of claim 10) and, for at least the above reasons also would not have been rendered obvious by the applied references. As such, the rejections of claims 4, 13, 19, 24, and 27 are deficient for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1 over Seaver. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

B. Claims 10 and 11

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Seaver and Morozov et al., Electrospray Deposition As A Method For Mass Fabrication Of Mono- and Multicomponent Microarrays of Biological and Biologically Active Substances, 71 Anal. Chem., 3110-3117 (1999) ("Morozov"). By this Amendment, claims 10 and 11 are canceled, rendering their rejection moot. However, because the subject matter of claim 10, *inter alia*, is incorporated into claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The combination of Seaver and Morozov would not have rendered obvious amended claim 1. In particular, the references would not have rendered obvious "adjusting a flow rate

of the solution so as to establish the following constant relational expression between a pressure and the flow rate: $P=b(V_c-V)+c$ as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, the applied references would not have rendered obvious claim 1.

Claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Seaver and Morozov.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan R. Brady
Registration No. 62,746

JAO:RRB/rrb

Date: March 1, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461